

Contents

Executive Summary	v	Congress Specifically for the NPS.....	19
Contents	xxix	1.7.2 Other Laws	20
Tables	xxxiii	1.7.3 NPS Regulations	21
Figures	xxxv	1.7.4 NPS Management Policies	21
Chapter One		1.7.5 NPS Director's Orders, Handbooks, and Other Guidance Documents	22
Purpose and Need for Action	1	1.7.6 Judicial Decisions.....	24
1.1 Introduction	3	1.8 Summary of Public Involvement/ Scoping	25
1.1.1 The Emerging Need to Define the Role, If Any, of the National Park Service When Research Involving Study of NPS Specimens Discovers Commercially Valuable Results	3	1.9 Issues and Impact Topics from Scoping ...	26
1.2 Background	4	1.9.1 Issues Analyzed as Impact Topics in Chapter 4	26
1.2.1 Changing Technologies and Their Role in the Programmatic Benefits-Sharing Proposal	4	1.9.3 Issues Not Evaluated Further in this DEIS	27
1.2.2 The National Park System's Natural Resources Invite Scientific Studies	6	Notes.....	31
1.2.3 Current Research in U.S. National Parks	8	Chapter Two	
1.2.4 Commercial Applications of NPS-related Research	10	Alternatives.....	35
1.3 Need for a Proposal to Implement Benefits-Sharing.....	12	2.1 Introduction	37
1.3.1 Existing Conditions: Clarity of Rights and Responsibilities Regarding Research Results	13	2.2 NPS Policies and Procedures That Would Remain Unchanged Under Every Alternative	38
1.3.2 Existing Conditions: Science for Park Management	14	2.2.1 Prohibition of Commercial Use of Natural Products.....	38
1.4 Objectives of the Proposal and Its Alternatives	14	2.2.2 NPS Research Permit Procedures.....	39
1.4.1 Clarity of Rights and Responsibilities Regarding Research Results	15	2.2.3 Intellectual Property Unaffected.....	39
1.4.2 Science for Park Management.....	15	2.3 Alternative A: No Benefits-Sharing/No Action	39
1.4.3 Research Permit Issuance Is Not Influenced By Potential Benefits-Sharing.....	16	2.3.1 Alternative A and the Yellowstone– Diversa CRADA	40
1.5 Benefits-Sharing by National Parks and Other Organizations.....	18	2.4 Alternative B: Implement Benefits-Sharing.....	40
1.6 Commercial Use of Research Results Discovered by Federal or Academic Scientists	18	2.4.1 Necessity for a Benefits-Sharing Agreement.....	41
1.7 Legal Framework	18	2.4.2 Procedure.....	42
1.7.1 NPS Mandates: Laws Enacted by		2.4.3 Disposition of Benefits.....	44
		2.4.4 Variations in Confidentiality: Alternatives B1, B2 and B3	44
		2.4.5 Assurances.....	46
		2.4.6 Mitigation	47
		2.4.7 Alternative B and the Yellowstone– Diversa CRADA	50
		2.5 Alternative C: Prohibit Specimen Collection for Any Commercially Related Research Purposes	50
		2.5.1 Alternative C and the Yellowstone– Diversa CRADA	51

2.6 Issues Addressed in the Alternatives	52
2.6.1 NPS Role Regarding Research Results Used for Commercial Purposes.....	53
2.6.2 Science for Park Management.....	55
2.7 Alternatives Considered But Not Analyzed Further.....	56
2.7.1 Prohibit Collection of Research Specimens from NPS Units	56
2.7.2 Prohibit Collection of Research Specimens from NPS Units by Non-Academic Researchers.....	56
2.7.3 Exempt Academic Researchers from Benefits-Sharing Agreements	57
2.7.4 Prohibit Any Commercial Use of Research Results Involving Study of Specimens Collected from NPS Units	57
2.8 Determination of the Environmentally Preferred Alternative	58
2.9 Summary of Alternatives and Effects	61
Notes.....	67

Chapter 3 Affected Environment..... 71

3.1 Introduction	73
3.2 NPS Natural Resource Management	73
3.2.1 Natural Resource Management and Science.....	74
3.2.2 Quantitative Measurements Used for Comparison of the Alternatives	78
3.3 NPS Visitor Experience and Enjoyment ...	79
3.3.1 Visitors and Natural Resources.....	79
3.3.2 NPS Interpretive Services	80
3.3.3 Interpretation for Natural Resource Management	81
3.3.4 Science in Interpretation.....	81
3.4 Social Resources: The Research Community.....	82
3.4.1 Researchers with NPS Research Permits.....	82
3.4.2 Third-Party Researchers	83
3.4.3 Research That Could Result in Commercial Application	84
3.5 Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations.....	90
3.5.1 Administration of NPS Agreements ...	90
3.5.2 Administration of NPS Scientific Research and Collecting Permits.....	91
3.5.3 Park Units Most Likely to be Affected by Alternative B (Implement Benefits- Sharing)	91

3.5.4 Existing Administrative Resources	92
Notes.....	93

Chapter 4 Environmental Consequences..... 97

4.1 Introduction	99
4.2 Methodologies for Evaluating Impacts .	100
4.2.1 Natural Resource Management	101
4.2.2 Visitor Experience and Enjoyment....	103
4.2.3 Social Resources: The Research Community.....	104
4.2.4 Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations	105
4.2.5 Impairment	106
4.2.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	107
4.3 Alternative A: No Benefits-Sharing/No Action	107
4.3.1 Impacts to Natural Resource Management	107
4.3.2 Impacts to Visitor Experience and Enjoyment.....	111
4.3.3 Impacts to Social Resources: The Research Community	113
4.3.4 Impacts to Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations	115
4.3.5 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	117
4.3.6 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity....	117
4.3.7 Adverse Effects that Cannot be Avoided	117
4.4 Alternative B: Implement Benefits- Sharing	117
4.4.1 Possible “Benefits” in Benefits-Sharing Agreements	117
4.4.2 Impacts to Natural Resource Management	121
4.4.3 Impacts to Visitor Experience and Enjoyment.....	131
4.4.4 Impacts to Social Resources: The Research Community	134
4.4.5 Impacts to Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations	137
4.4.6 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	146
4.4.7 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity....	146
4.4.8 Adverse Effects that Cannot Be Avoided	146

4.5 Alternative C: Prohibit Research Specimen Collection for Any Commercially Related Research Purposes	146
4.5.1 Analysis Common to All Impact Topics.....	147
4.5.2 Natural Resource Management	147
4.5.3 Visitor Experience and Enjoyment....	151
4.5.4 Social Resources: The Research Community.....	152
4.5.5 Social Resources: NPS Administrative Operations	155
4.5.6 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources.....	157
4.5.7 Relationship Between Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity....	157
4.5.8 Adverse Effects that Cannot Be Avoided	157
Notes.....	157

Chapter 5	
Consultation and Coordination	161

Chapter 6	
Glossary	165

Chapter 7	
Bibliography	171

Appendix A	
Model Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) ...	183
Article 1. Legal Authority	187
Article 2. Definitions.....	187
Article 3. Statement of Work.....	192
Article 4. Reports	192
Article 5. Collaborator’s Benefits-Sharing Obligation	194
Article 6. Recognition of Contribution from [Name of Collaborating Unit of the National Park System]	195
Article 7. Patent Rights.....	195
Article 8. Copyrights	197
Article 9. Copyright Royalties	198
Article 10. Data and Publication.....	198
Article 11. Rights in Generated Information	200

Article 12. Termination.....	200
Article 13. Disputes.....	201
Article 14. Liability	202
Article 15. Miscellaneous Terms and Conditions	204
Article 16. Duration of Agreement and Effective Date.....	206
Signature Page.....	208
Statement of Work	209
CRADA Appendix A	210
CRADA Appendix B	211

Appendix B	
Model Material Transfer Agreement (MTA)	213
B.1 Definitions.....	215
B.2 Terms and Conditions of this Agreement and Authorization	217
B.3 Administration.....	218
Signature Page.....	219

Appendix C	
Estimating Potential Monetary Benefits Under Alternative B (Implement Benefits-Sharing)	223
C.1 Introduction	225
C.2 Monetary Benefits Types: Up-Front and Performance-Based.....	225
C.3 Monetary Benefits Timing	226
C.4 License Income Reported by Federal and Academic Research Institutions	229
C.5 Research Result Income Received by Commercial Firms	231
C.6 CRADA Income Received by Federal Agencies	231
C.7 Potential Number of Agreements that Could Be Active Annually in the NPS	232
C.8 Modeling Potential Monetary Benefits.....	236
C.9 Summary of Potential Monetary Benefits.....	245
C.10 Data and Calculations	249
C.11 Comparing Estimated Monetary Benefits to Impact Thresholds	258

Notes.....	261	
Appendix D		
Public Involvement—Scoping	265	
D.1 Introduction.....	267	
D.2 Scoping Methodology	267	
D.3 Analysis Methodology	268	
D.4 How Scoping Comments Were Addressed.....	269	
D.5 Summary of Public Scoping Comments .	270	
Notes.....	272	
Appendix E		
Research Trends Analysis	273	
Appendix F		
An Informal Public–Private Partnership in Service to Yellowstone Natural Resources.....	279	
Appendix G		
Background for Benefits-Sharing and Technology Transfer	283	
G.1 Benefits-Sharing by the U.S. Government.....	285	
G.2 Benefits-Sharing Around the World	288	
G.3 Commercial Use of Research Results Discovered by Federal or Academic Scientists.....	290	
Notes.....	295	
Index	299	

List of Tables

Table ES-1. Summary of Effects	xix
Table ES-1. Summary of Effects, continued	xx
Table ES-1. Summary of Effects, continued	xxi
Table ES-1. Summary of Effects, continued	xxii
Table 1.2.2. National Park System acreage in each ecoregion division	8
Table 2.6. Issues Addressed in the Alternatives	52
Table 2.9-1. Comparison of Alternatives	61
Table 2.9-2. Summary of Effects	62
Table 2.9-2. Summary of Effects, continued	63
Table 2.9-2. Summary of Effects, continued	64
Table 2.9-2. Summary of Effects, continued	65
Table 3.4.3.2. Bioprospectors in NPS units, 2001	86
Table 4.4.1. Potential benefit types and timing generated by a single CRADA	118
Table 4.4.1.2-1. Estimated range of potential monetary benefits used to analyze the impacts of a proposed NPS benefits-sharing program on individual parks other than Yellowstone	120, 255
Table 4.4.1.2-2. Range of potential monetary benefits used to analyze the impacts of a proposed NPS benefits-sharing program on individual parks other than Yellowstone	121, 247
Table 4.4.2.3. All potential monetary benefits compared to the \$73 million NPS Natural Resource Challenge, FY2004.....	125
Table 4.4.2.4. Potential monetary benefits equivalent to a percentage of Yellowstone natural resource management funding level, FY2002.....	128
Table 4.4.2.5. Beneficial impacts to natural resource management at 43 representative parks.....	130
Table 4.4.5.1. Potential servicewide benefits-sharing administrative burden	138
Table 4.4.5.2. Potential Yellowstone benefits-sharing administrative burden.....	139
Table 4.4.5.3. Potential individual park benefits-sharing administrative burden (one benefits-sharing agreement)	140
Table 4.5.1. Potential consequences of Alternative C	147
Table C.3.1. Average duration of CRADAs and AUTM licenses	227
Table C.4.1-1. Proportion of AUTM licenses that yielded income	230
Table C.4.1-2. Proportion of AUTM licenses that yielded royalties	230
Table C.7.1. NPS-related patents granted annually	232
Table C.7.2-1. Comparative rates of inventing and patenting in federal laboratories and academic institutions	233
Table C.7.2-2. Estimated annual number of NPS-related inventions	234
Table C.7.3. Number of agreements that could generate benefits	235
Table C.8.1.5. Analysis of potential annual benefits per average benefits-sharing agreement based on data reported by AUTM (Model One)	238

Table C.8.2.5. Analysis of potential annual benefits per benefits-sharing agreement based on data reported by federal laboratories and AUTM (Model Two)	240
Table C.8.3.1. Global markets	241
Table C.8.3.2. Federal and academic license income greater than \$1 million	242
Table C.8.4.2. Estimated potential average annual monetary benefits of Model Two applied to a single agreement	244
Table C.8.5. Patents and assignees known to be related to study of NPS specimens, 1978–2003	245
Table C.9. Average monetary benefits per benefits-sharing agreement	245
Table C.10.1. Calculations in support of Table C.7.2-1 (Comparative rate of inventing and patenting in federal laboratories and academic institutions)	249
Table C.10.2-1. Data reported by AUTM and used for development of Model One and Tables 10.2-2 and 10.2-3	250
Table C.10.2-2. Calculations for Model One (estimated immediate monetary benefits)	250
Table C.10.2-3. Calculations for Model One (estimated deferred monetary benefits).....	251
Table C.10.3-1. Data reported by the Department of Commerce and used for development of Model Two and Tables 10.3-2 and 10.3-3	252
Table C.10.3-2. Calculations for Model Two (estimated immediate monetary benefits)	253
Table C.10.3-3. Calculations for Model Two (estimated deferred monetary benefits)	254
Table C.10.4.1-1. Estimated annual average monetary benefits per agreement	256
Table C.10.4.1-2. Calculating estimated potential monetary benefits	257
Table C.11-1. Comparison of potential SERVICEWIDE monetary benefits to FY2004 Natural Resource Challenge funding	258
Table C.11-2. Comparison of potential YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK monetary benefits to Yellowstone’s identified natural resource management funding level.....	258
Table C.11-3. Comparison of potential INDIVIDUAL PARK monetary benefits to each park’s natural resource management funding level	259
Table C.11-3. Comparison of potential INDIVIDUAL PARK monetary benefits to each park’s natural resource management funding level, continued	260
Table C.11-4. Number of study parks at each impact threshold ($n = 43$).....	260
Table E-1. Number of Scientific Research and Collecting Permits issued by Yellowstone, 1992–2001	276
Table E-2. Chi-square calculation, the number of Scientific Research and Collecting Permits issued by Yellowstone, 1992–2001, and 1992–1997 compared to 1998–2001	276
Table E-3. Number of research reports (IAR) submitted to Yellowstone, 1992–2001	276
Table E-4. Chi-square calculation, the number of research reports (IAR) submitted to Yellowstone, 1992–2001, and 1992–1997 compared to 1998–2001	277
Table E-5. Number of research reports (IAR) submitted to 38 parks, 1992–2001	277
Table E-6. Chi-square calculation, the number of research reports (IAR) submitted to 38 parks, 1992–2001, and 1992–1997 compared to 1998–2001	277
Table E-7. Number of research reports (IAR) submitted servicewide, 1992–2001	278
Table E-8. Chi-square calculation, the number of research reports (IAR) submitted servicewide, 1992–2001, and 1992–1997 compared to 1998–2001	278

List of Figures

Figure 1.2.2-1. National park units are spread across the United States.	7
Figure 1.2.2-2. National park units are located within every terrestrial ecoregion of the U.S.	7
Figure 1.2.3. An average of 235 parks received research reports (IARs) each year during 2001–2004.	9
Figure 1.2.4.1. Between 1978 and 2003, The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office granted at least 45 patents based upon research results related to the study of biological material originating in U.S. national parks.	11
Figure 3.2.2.1. The NPS Business Plan Initiative identified funding levels for natural resource management operations.	78
Figure 3.3.2. Millions of park visitors experienced NPS interpretive services in 2004.	80
Figure 3.4.3.2. Less than 1% of all independent researchers performing research in NPS units were declared bioprospectors in 2001.	87
Figure 3.5.4. The number of available administrative FTEs per park varies considerably.	93
Figure 4.3.1.6. In addition to a general increase in funding for research, the balance of federal funding has shifted over the last three decades in favor of the life sciences.	110
Figure 4.4.2.3-1. An NPS benefits-sharing program could generate monetary benefits that would increase over time because CRADAs would obligate researchers to make performance-based payments and such obligation would survive termination of the CRADA.	125
Figure 4.4.2.3-2. Monetary benefits could have a negligible and, in some instances, minor beneficial impacts on servicewide natural resource management.	126
Figure 4.4.2.4. The monetary benefits derived from benefits-sharing program could have a negligible short-term beneficial impact on Yellowstone natural resource management and a long-term negligible-to-major beneficial impact.	129
Figure C.3. A benefits-sharing agreement could generate monetary benefits during either the immediate benefits period, the deferred benefits period, both periods, or neither period.	226
Figure C.3.2. Each agreement's obligation to provide immediate benefits would expire, but its obligation to provide performance-based payments through the 20-year DEIS analysis period would continue. ...	228
Figure C.8.4.1. Model One estimates that every benefits-sharing agreement could generate some income.	243
Figure C.8.4.2. Annual licensing income at academic institutions ranged from \$0 for more than half of all licenses to more than \$1 million for 0.6% of licenses in 1999–2002.	243
Figure G.3.1.-1. The number of active CRADAs managed by the Department of the Interior is increasing. ...	291
Figure G.3.1-2. Several thousand CRADAs were active annually from 1999 through 2003.	291
Figure G.3.1-3. During the five-year period FY1999–FY2003, federal researchers reported discovering approximately 3,900 inventions (commercial applications for research results) annually.	292
Figure G.3.2-1. On average, more than 22,000 technology transfer licenses were active annually from FY1999–FY2002.	294
Figure G.3.2-2. During 1999–2002, academic researchers disclosed an average of more than 13,000 inventions (commercial applications for research results) annually.	294

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK